

# An Environmental Scan of OCLC Alternatives

A Final Report Prepared for



April 2015

Prepared by

JRM Consulting Inc.  
Carlsbad, CA

# Table of Contents

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
About OCLC	2
Exploring Alternatives	3
The Cataloging Alternatives	8
Online Access	8
Other Libraries, Using Z39.50	10
Internet Resources	12
Material Vendors	15
Outsourcing Vendors	18
Comparison of Cataloging Alternatives	20
The Interlibrary Loan Alternatives	22
Comparison of Interlibrary Loan Alternatives	27
Recommendations	29
Negotiate a SkyRiver Master Agreement	30
Create a Cataloging Center	30
Create a RAILS Shared Catalog/ILL System	31
Make the RAILS Shared Catalog Discoverable	32
Encourage Libraries to Purchase Materials in Lieu of Using ILL	32
Periodically Offer a Webinar on Cataloging Alternatives	32
Appendix	33
Bibliography	39

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was prepared at the request of Reaching Across Illinois Library System (RAILS), which was seeking an environmental scan of library consortia outside Illinois that do not require all members to use OCLC for bibliographic and interlibrary loan services. The Appendix to this report provides summary information about consortia contacted as a part of this study.

OCLC's WorldCat now holds more than 321 million bibliographic records with some 2+ billion holdings linked to the bibliographic records. The cost of OCLC Group Services for Illinois libraries amounts to \$4,411,751 (starting in the fiscal year beginning in July 2015). These Group Services includes basic interlibrary loan and cataloging and the costs are allocated to all Illinois libraries that use OCLC services.

The Group Services fee for each library is based largely on its history of OCLC use and when it became an OCLC member. Over time, this has resulted in a lack of transparency in pricing and significant differences in OCLC fees for libraries of similar size. For many libraries, the annual OCLC cost exceeds or approaches the annual cost of membership in a shared integrated library system, which serves as a disincentive to participation in shared systems and thus discourages resource sharing.

### Cataloging Alternatives

Among the alternatives for obtaining bibliographic records from sources other than OCLC are:

- Online access, including SkyRiver
- Other libraries, using Z39.50
- Internet resources

- Vendors that supply physical and electronic resources
- Outsourcing cataloging vendors.

**Comparison Of Cataloging Alternatives.** Based on the experiences of the consortia that participated in this study, few problems are experienced when loading MARC records from multiple sources. Every ILS system provides a relatively robust method for comparing a record being imported against the existing database to identify possible duplicate records using a combination of data elements.

Providing access to SkyRiver as a source of cataloging records will result in considerable cataloging cost savings for RAILS member libraries. In addition, it is recognized that libraries will continue to rely on the vendors that supply materials for some of the needed bibliographic records. And many libraries will continue to download MARC records from other libraries using the Z39.50 protocol.

## **THE INTERLIBRARY LOAN ALTERNATIVES**

Interlibrary loan or ILL has long been used to provide access to information resources beyond what is available in the local library collection. Based on the results of several studies and ignoring delivery costs, about 2/3rds of total ILL costs are borne by the lending library.

Public libraries, especially libraries that are in a consortium with a shared online catalog (or contribute local library records to a regional or statewide union catalog to facilitate resource sharing), have found that the 80/20 rule applies – 80% (or more) of all ILL transactions occur within the shared online catalog and usually are called within-system loans (rather than ILL transactions) – while a smaller percent of ILL transactions occur as a result of a regional or statewide union catalog.

RAILS is currently exploring the costs and benefits of creating a RAILS regional catalog or discovery layer as part of its resource sharing overlay project.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Investigate a SkyRiver Master Agreement.** RAILS should investigate a master agreement with SkyRiver for a minimum of five years, on behalf of its member libraries, that is similar to the agreement made by the Colorado Library Consortium. RAILS would assume responsibility for marketing, training, as well as providing support for the SkyRiver product in exchange for significantly reduced annual licensing fees.

And while moving to SkyRiver will take some time, the cost saving for Illinois libraries are likely to be significant.

**Create a Cataloging Center.** RAILS should establish a centralized cataloging center that would provide cataloging of current acquisitions, particularly when original cataloging is needed, for member libraries as an outsourcing option. A RAILS cataloging center would provide a consistent level of cataloging for member libraries using SkyRiver as a primary source of cataloging records.

**Create a RAILS Regional Catalog/ILL System.** A state-of-the-art RAILS regional catalog/ILL system should be created for interested member libraries as envisioned by the overlay project that will provide both discovery and fulfillment.

Given that more than 80% or more of all borrowing of materials occurs among libraries within a consortium sharing an integrated library system (or within a statewide union catalog), this recommendation has the potential to dramatically improve the quality of resource sharing among RAILS member libraries while at the same time noticeably reducing costs for interlibrary loan among member libraries.

**Make the RAILS Regional Catalog Discoverable.** Open up the RAILS regional catalog database to the Google (and other) Web crawlers so the full contents of the catalog are visible when people use Google to find things of interest. For far too long, library databases (including the catalog) have been hidden behind walls and exist in silos.

**Encourage Libraries to Evaluate Purchase Materials in Lieu of Using ILL.**

RAILS should encourage each library to determine when purchasing an item is better (less expensive and may result in the patron receiving an item faster) than initiating an ILL request.

**Periodically Offer a Webinar on Cataloging Alternatives.** Periodically offering a Webinar about the strengths and limitations of each of the cataloging and technical service alternatives will benefit the RAILS member libraries.

## INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared at the request of Reaching Across Illinois Library System (RAILS), which was seeking an environmental scan of library consortia outside Illinois that do not require all members to use OCLC for bibliographic and interlibrary loan services. In response to this request, JRM Consulting with the assistance of RAILS, identified twelve consortia outside Illinois that use a variety of methods other than using OCLC. A summary of the approaches each consortium has taken along with a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages for each approach may be found in the Appendix.

Each consortium was interviewed via telephone using a standard set of questions as a starting point for the conversation (see the Appendix for a summary of each consortium's approach to cataloging and ILL). A series of emails was used as follow-up to obtain additional information. In addition the consultant performed a literature review to ensure that all relevant issues were identified and discussed (see the Bibliography for sources that were consulted).

We are, indeed, living in interesting times. Google has demonstrated that it can index the Web. (It can also apply its considerable wealth to digitize the world's libraries. Google Books, with about 30 million books already digitized, is aiming to have 100 million books digitized by 2020.) Amazon provides such a compelling and interesting online experience, with book jacket images, reviews, ratings, recommendations, a look inside and so forth, that it has become a dominant force in selling print and electronic books – among a host of other products. A number of other online suppliers provide access to the “long tail” of older new and used books, CDs, and DVDs.

In our Internet age, the library catalog is no longer the starting point for information searches. People have moved away from finding containers of

information on the shelves of libraries to discovering information when and where they need it – often with hand-held devices such as smartphones. The end result, as noted by Lorcan Dempsey, the vice-president for research at OCLC, is that “discovery happens elsewhere.” This suggests that the value of the library catalog is diminishing and considering less expensive options for obtaining MARC records would seem a prudent course of action.

## ABOUT OCLC

OCLC, a non-profit library cooperative, currently has 16,857 members in 113 countries (5,193 public libraries, 5,053 college and university libraries, 1063 community college and vocation libraries, 1,875 school libraries, and members in many other types of libraries). WorldCat now holds more than 321 million bibliographic records with some 2+ billion holdings linked to the bibliographic records.<sup>1</sup> Illinois libraries have contributed approximately 89 million holdings.<sup>2</sup> In 2014, total OCLC revenues from all operations were \$213,575,500. After liabilities are subtracted from all assets, OCLC has reserves (Corporate Equity) amounting to \$266,911,900. Compared to all other options, OCLC is clearly the very large elephant in the room.

OCLC provides a broad range of services including:

- WorldShare Metadata Services (cataloging)
- WorldShare Interlibrary Loan (sharing resources)
- WorldShare Management Services (cloud-based integrated library system)
- WorldCat Discovery Services
- CONTENTdm (manage digital collections).

---

<sup>1</sup> OCLC. *Advancing Together: Annual Report 2013-2014*. Dublin, OH: OLCC, 2014, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Understanding OCLC Services in the State of Illinois* (Revised Feb. 2015). Available at [https://www.cyberdriveillinois.com/departments/library/libraries/OCLC/pdfs/oclc\\_srvcs\\_il.pdf](https://www.cyberdriveillinois.com/departments/library/libraries/OCLC/pdfs/oclc_srvcs_il.pdf)



The cost of OCLC Group Services for Illinois libraries amounts to \$4,411,751 (starting in the fiscal year beginning in July 2015). These costs are allocated to all Illinois libraries that use OCLC services. This Group Services charge includes basic interlibrary loan and cataloging costs.

The Group Services fee for each library is based largely on its history of OCLC use and when it became an OCLC member. Over time, this has resulted in a lack of transparency in pricing and significant differences in OCLC fees for libraries of similar size. For example, one public library with serving a population of 43,862 and with a circulation of 263,512 will pay OCLC \$2,371.74 in FY2016. A similar public library with a population served of 43,116 and a circulation of 351,242 will be charged \$18,687.75 for FY2016. For many libraries, the annual OCLC cost exceeds or approaches the annual cost of membership in a shared integrated library system, which serves as a disincentive to participation in shared systems and thus discourages resource sharing. These high costs and cost discrepancies between similar libraries have led to increasing dissatisfaction with OCLC services.

## EXPLORING ALTERNATIVES

Any discussion of alternatives must, of necessity, explore a variety of perspectives or topics in order to better understand the strengths and limitations of each alternative. In this case, the topics that determine the ultimate utility of each alternative include:

- **Breadth of the Database** – size and diversity of the bibliographic database. The larger the database and the more diverse the database in terms of language and type of formats, the more likely a library will find a record it needs and it will not need to create an original cataloging record

- **Quality of the Database** – quality is determined by the amount of records that do not adhere to certain prescribed standards and the number of duplicate records. Library catalogs *typically* contain very good metadata since they are created and maintained using content standards, classification, and authority control to describe and collocate related materials. However, not every record is necessarily of acceptable quality in any database – even in the case of OCLC.
- **Ease of Use of the Database** – the user interface for searching, viewing, selecting and then using a bibliographic record controls the ease of use. The ease of use will have a significant impact on the overall productivity for performing a specific activity (assuming the library has worked to optimize the workflows and processes to accomplish an activity). Ease of use is further complicated by the fact that users often are attempting to complete two different tasks: known item searching, and browsing to find something of interest. For users, ease of use and convenience trumps quality of information.
- **Costs of Use of the Database** – the database provider determines the cost associated with downloading one or more records.

The activities of library technical services can be grouped into three broad supply chain models:

- The library assumes responsibility for all selection, cataloging, and processing of materials in-house, often with very customized processing requirements.
- The library fully outsources acquisition and supply of shelf-ready library materials.
- The library purchases its materials using a combination of the first two options.

Cataloging can be conveniently divided into two activities: using an existing record (often called copy cataloging) or creating a new or original cataloging record. Obviously copy cataloging is much less expensive than original cataloging.

One of the ongoing and much-discussed issues in the library profession is the degree to which a cataloging record can be used “as is” or whether the record must be edited and upgraded to meet some library-defined standard. The definition of a “minimally acceptable cataloging record” (for example, specifying the number and type of subject headings that must be present in each non-fiction bibliographic record) will determine the amount of editing that must be done by a library and that, in turn, determines the time and costs to accomplish this task for each bibliographic record. Interestingly, one recent study found that 80% of libraries edit an existing cataloging record for English-language monographs.<sup>3</sup> This suggests that there is still pervasive resistance to the idea of simply accepting the work of another librarian.

One indirect measure of the presence of a relatively high cataloging standard is the existence of a cataloging backlog. The institution’s stakeholders have determined that the library will not receive additional resources to deal with the backlog while the librarians have not recognized the need to adjust their standards to reflect current economic realities. Several studies have shown that editing an existing cataloging record costs a library from \$10 to \$18 per record, depending on the amount of changes made to the bibliographic record. And the cost of original cataloging can vary from \$30 per record and up.

Cataloging and technical services departments in the vast majority of libraries are quite inefficient and libraries that have moved these services to a local or

---

<sup>3</sup> Ruth Fischer and Rick Lugg. *Study of the North American MARC Records Marketplace*. A Report prepared for the Library of Congress. October 2009. Available at [http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/MARC\\_Record\\_Marketplace\\_2009-10.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/MARC_Record_Marketplace_2009-10.pdf)

regional consortium or outsourced these activities typically achieve significant cost savings. And public libraries purchase 80% or more of the same materials making economies of scale even more achievable in a consortial environment.

One of the issues associated with resource sharing is the degree to which any database accurately reflects the holdings of a library. One assumption often made by librarians is that the OCLC database is a fairly accurate database in terms of reflecting materials actually found in the library itself. There are several problems with this assumption:

- Many libraries do not report records that they obtain from other sources, in particular records from vendors that provide physical and electronic resources (records might come from Baker & Taylor, Ingram, Midwest Tapes, Overdrive, and many more vendors). If the experience of the CARL consortium in Denver, Colorado is any indication, as much as 1/3 of a library's MARC records might not be reflected in their holdings on OCLC.
- Many libraries do not report records that have been withdrawn from the local library catalog to OCLC due to time and cost constraints. Thus, the OCLC database might reflect materials that were once in a library collection but have now been weeded and withdrawn from the library's online catalog.
- Some materials, such as materials found in special collections or local history collections, have never been cataloged using the OCLC system due to time and cost constraints.
- Items placed in an organization's digital repository often rely on the individual downloading the content to create the metadata. The resulting metadata is often not compatible with a traditional library MARC cataloging record and so this content is not loaded into the OCLC database.

It is also important to note that every option for obtaining cataloging records typically allows a library to download MARC (Machine Readable Cataloging) records one-by-one or in a batch file. Some sources now provide the option of downloading the cataloging record in an XML (eXtensible Markup Language) format – although some ILS systems cannot load XML records. These XML formatted records are known by several names depending upon the implementation - ONIX, XMLMARC or MARCXML records.

ONIX is a standard data format (using the XML structure) to share information about books and digital products between publishers, distributors, wholesalers and retailers (and libraries). A framework has been developed for mapping MARC data into the ONIX or XML format.

XMLMARC is a computer program developed by the Lane Medical Library at the Stanford University Medical Center that converts MARC records into XML. This open source software can be downloaded and used by other libraries.

The Library of Congress has developed a MARCXML Toolkit and framework that allows a library to convert to and from the MARC format to/from the XML format. The Library of Congress maintains a Web site that provides documentation and examples of converting a MARC record into a HTML presentation, a Dublin core transformation, and a MODS transformation, a ONIX transformation, among other options.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.loc.gov/standards/marcxml/>

## THE CATALOGING ALTERNATIVES

In a report, Ruth Fischer and Rick Lugg suggested that there are about 200 organizations that create, distribute, and/or sell MARC cataloging records and/or MARC services to North American libraries. Among the alternatives for obtaining bibliographic records from sources other than OCLC are:

- Online access, including SkyRiver
- Other libraries, using Z39.50
- Internet resources
- Vendors that supply physical and electronic resources
- Outsourcing cataloging vendors.

The first three options assume that the library (or consortium) will have their staff use a service to download (or create) the necessary cataloging records. The last two options provide an alternative for the library (or consortium) for reducing or eliminating the cataloging and technical services staff. Each of these alternatives will be explored in considerable detail in the following pages of this report.

### Online Access

A library (or consortium if it is providing centralized cataloging) can continue to provide cataloging services using its own staff but use a source other than OCLC for the MARC bibliographic records. The most noticeable option is SkyRiver.

**SkyRiver** – is a full-service cataloging utility that offers unlimited, one-click access to a growing database. SkyRiver is owned and operated by Innovative Interfaces Inc., a long-time integrated library system vendor. SkyRiver customers can download records into any integrated library system (ILS). There are no limits as to the number of records that can be downloaded and there are no limits as to how the records can be used.

Currently SkyRiver has some 93 customers, of which 8 are library consortia. One customer, the Colorado Library Consortium (CLiC), provides SkyRiver to the 75 small rural public libraries that contribute their catalog records to AspenCat. In addition, another 25 Colorado libraries have signed up to use SkyRiver through an agreement between SkyRiver and CLiC. CLiC markets SkyRiver to Colorado libraries and provides installation, training and support for significantly reduced SkyRiver licensing fees. SkyRiver provides:

- **Breadth** – some 70 million unique cataloging records plus public domain metadata from SkyRiver customer libraries and other contributing libraries. A majority of SkyRiver customers indicate that they find 98%+ of the copy cataloging records that they need.
- **Quality** – The system supports accommodating all levels of Resource Description and Access (RDA) – the new cataloging standard – including a hybrid AACR2/RDA record. The MARC records within the SkyRiver system are quite good based on reports from consortia that are SkyRiver customers. The records include the Library of Congress database plus others contributed by various large libraries.
- **Ease of Use** – The user interface is quite good and makes for quickly locating the records of interest. All of individuals interviewed for this study indicated that the SkyRiver system is easy to use.
- **Costs** – The costs of the SkyRiver system vary depending on the size and number of libraries that wish to use the system. In general SkyRiver costs are lower than OCLC costs by at least half (and often times more).

As seen below, the average cost per SkyRiver bibliographic record is 82 cents but since the SkyRiver service does not impose a per record charge, the more the resource is used, the lower the cost per record.

Table 1. SkyRiver Costs

<i>Consortium</i>	<i>Cost of SkyRiver</i>	<i>Number of Cataloging Records Added/Year</i>	<i>Cost per Bibliographic Record</i>
Black Gold Cooperative, CA	\$ 16,500	9,000	\$ 1.83
Four County Library System, NY	15,000	12,500	1.20
Lakeland Library Cooperative, MI	49,500	35,747	1.38
Lakeshores Library System, WI	36,500	30,000	1.22
The Library Network, MI	42,250	50,000	.85
OWLSnet Public Library System, WI	40,000	100,000	.40
SAILS Library Network, MA	38,696	52,462	.73
Suffolk County Lib. Cooperative, NY		90,000	
Totals/Average*	\$ 34,064	41,387	\$ .82

\* Excluding Suffolk County

### **Other Libraries, Using Z39.50**

Many libraries provide access to their online catalog and allow other libraries to download one or more MARC records. An international standard known as Z39.50 allows a library to perform a search and download a MARC record. The standard supports a number of actions, including search, retrieve, sort, and browse.

For example, the Library of Congress (LC) maintains a MARC database of about 25 million bibliographic records, which are accessible using the Z39.50 standard. LC processes more than 500,000 Z39.50 search requests each day. And thousands of other libraries, including most national libraries, also provide access to their cataloging database using Z39.50.



In the Fischer and Lugg study, about 15% of libraries reported they acquire a significant portion of their bibliographic records via the Z39.50 protocol. Every integrated library system (ILS) provides and supports Z39.50 software. Using Z39.50 software, an individual can select a group of libraries, typically based on type of material to be cataloged, which will likely retrieve a record of interest. A number of libraries maintain lists of library catalogs that are accessible using Z39.50.<sup>5</sup>

Interestingly, about a third of commercial MARC record providers make their records accessible using the Z39.50 protocol (although in some cases you must be a customer in one way or another to use this service).

One central source, *biblios.net*, provides free access to over 30 million cataloging records that can be downloaded in either MARC or XML format. *biblios.net* also contains a list of over 2,000 Z39.50 servers making it easy for catalogers to find and share bibliographic resources. The *biblios.net* service is underwritten by LibLime (providers of the open source Koha library software) and LibLime is a division of PTFS, Inc.

*WebClarity*, a developer of Z39.50 software maintains a Z39.50 target directory. Of the 2,160 libraries in this directory, 51% are academic, 21% public, 8% special, 7% consortia, 6% national and state, and 6% other.

- **Breadth** – Given the very large number of libraries that provide Z39.50 access to their collections, including national, large academic and public libraries, the total number of records must exceed 100 million bibliographic records.

---

<sup>5</sup> See for example the Cataloguer's Toolbox created by the University of Newfoundland at <http://staff.library.mun.ca/staff/toolbox/z3950hosts.htm>

- **Quality** – In the consultant’s opinion, the quality of records in general will be quite high although some records may require editing to upgrade the quality of the record.
- **Ease of Use** – Most Z39.50 software is very easy to use and download bibliographic records.
- **Costs** – The cost of the downloaded records is free (ignoring staff costs).

## Internet Resources

There are a number of Internet Web sites that actively encourage people that love books to catalog their own personal collections as well as become more engaged with their online community. Sometimes these sites are called “social cataloging sites.” Interestingly these sites use some of the same resources that libraries use to create bibliographic cataloging records, e.g., using Z39.50 to find records. Libraries can join a site, for a small fee, and add records and holdings information to the Web site. Some libraries are doing this to become more engaged with people who live near them or have an interest in a special collection featured by the library.

Content for bibliographic records can be copied and pasted into a cataloging system using one of the Internet resources. *LibraryThing*, *Goodreads*, *Shelfari* and *Open Library* are among the more popular social cataloging sites:

**LibraryThing.** As of March 2015, this site has cataloged more than 95 million books, and the almost 2 million members have contributed some 115 million tags, more than 2 million reviews, 1 million book cover images, and more than 14 million ratings.

*LibraryThing* provides a set of APIs (Application Programming Interface) that would allow a library to download and use a wide variety of useful data – including bibliographic records.<sup>6</sup>

- **Breadth** – As noted above, *LibraryThing* contains more than 95 million bibliographic records that can be downloaded.
- **Quality** – The quality of the bibliographic records ranges from acceptable to quite bad. Many of the records come from the Library of Congress and many other libraries (although the library may not be a *LibraryThing* member). Note that *LibraryThing* record has all of the elements specified by the International Standard for Bibliographic Description (ISBD) for monographs.<sup>7</sup>
- **Ease of Use** – A library would obtain information from *LibraryThing* using APIs.
- **Costs** – Information may be downloaded from *LibraryThing* for no cost. However, the library (or consortium) will need a programmer to develop the necessary software to download, store and then use the requested information.

Some small libraries use *LibraryThing* as a site for cataloging as well as using *LibraryThing* as the library's online catalog.

**Goodreads.** *Goodreads* is the largest site for readers and book recommendations with some 30 million members and more than 900 million holdings information. Members have contributed some 34 million reviews. *Goodreads* bestows the title of “Librarian” for those “few” people who are

---

<sup>6</sup> The Everett (WA) Public Library and the San Antonio (TX) Public Library responded to an AUTOCAT query that they use social cataloging sites as a source of cataloging records and to obtain information that will add to existing records.

<sup>7</sup> Spiteri, Louise. The Impact of Social Cataloging Sites on the Construction of Bibliographic Records in the Public Library Catalog. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 47:1, 2009, 52-73.

interested in keeping things “nice and tidy” – while an elite few can become “Super Librarians.”

- **Breadth** – *Goodreads* has more than 100 million bibliographic records.
- **Quality** – The quality of the bibliographic records are variable given the data comes from a variety of sources – including data entered directly by a member.
- **Ease of Use** – *Goodreads* provides an extensive set of APIs that a library could use to download bibliographic records, reviews, and other information.
- **Costs** – *Goodreads* provides access to its large database for free. The library will need to use the *Goodreads* APIs to extract the information, which will require programmer support.

**Shelfari.** *Shelfari* claims that it is a community-powered encyclopedia for book lovers. Users track what they have read, can create their own catalog of their personal library, contribute recommendations, reviews, plot summaries, quotes, character descriptions and more, makes recommendations based on what you have read, and engage with others that share a love of reading. *Shelfari* was acquired by Amazon in 2008.

- **Breadth** – *Shelfari* has a database that contains about 30 million bibliographic records.
- **Quality** – The overall quality of the database seems mixed and many records are short. Users may edit each book's authors, title, publication data, table of contents, first sentence, and series.
- **Ease of Use** – *Shelfari* promotes its “virtual bookshelf” – a one of its main features. This site is easy to use and navigate. A library would need to have a programmer develop the necessary software to take advantage of *Shelfari*'s APIs to download information from the site.

- **Costs** – There is no charge to download information from *Shelfari*.

**Open Library.** *Open Library* is an open project that has gathered over 20 million bibliographic records from a variety of large library catalogs with the goal of creating a Web page for every book ever published. *Open Library* is a project of the non-profit Internet Archive that encourages people and librarians to add records and content to existing records. *Open Library* provides free access to cataloging data through the use of an API.

- **Breadth** – *Open Library* has a database that contains over 20 million bibliographic records.
- **Quality** – The overall quality of the database seems quite good (majority of records come from library catalogs). Users may edit each book's record, add an image of the book cover and so forth.
- **Ease of Use** – The *Open Library* site is easy to use and navigate. A library would need to have a programmer develop the necessary software to take advantage of *Open Library's* APIs to download information from the site.
- **Costs** – There is no charge to download information from *Open Library*.

## Material Vendors

Vendors that supply libraries with physical and electronic resources will, in almost every case, provide corresponding MARC records for each item purchased. From the larger material vendors, such as Baker & Taylor, Ingram, Midwest Tapes, Brodart, YBP Library Services and publishers and aggregators of electronic journals and eBooks such as Overdrive, Elsevier, ProQuest, Emerald, EBSCO, among many more to the smaller vendors, providing MARC records has become an operational necessity if the vendor does not want to lose market

share. 90% of material vendors report that their MARC record operation is profitable or break-even.

Innovative Interfaces also provides a service called *eMARC Express* that any library can use. The *eMARC Express* service provides full MARC records with subject headings, contents notes, and other points of access for OverDrive and 3M Cloud Library (eBook) records that match a library's orders one for one. The price is 85 cents per full record.

The material vendors obtain the majority of records directly from publishers and from the Library of Congress if they maintain their own bibliographic database. It should be noted that some material vendors use the OCLC cataloging system to generate MARC records for the titles they distribute. The following table provides some basic information about some of the major vendors in terms of providing MARC records.

- ***Breadth*** – In almost all cases, each materials vendor provides a MARC record for each title (item) that they sell to a library. The largest materials vendors all maintain cataloging systems that have a very large MARC record database that has been created over the years. With rare exceptions, a vendor will always provide a MARC record for each item ordered – even if they have to create an original MARC record to do so. Many vendors also find records that they need using the Z39.50 protocol.
- ***Quality*** – In general, the MARC records provided by a materials vendor are fairly good. However, most libraries will edit these records for physical materials. Libraries (or a consortium) generally need to perform some “clean up” work in order to load records from vendors providing electronic content – eBooks, and so forth.
- ***Ease of Use*** – Having the supplied records conform to a standard MARC record simplifies the task of loading records into the shared automated system.

Table 2. Material Vendor Bibliographic Record Costs

<i>Vendor</i>	<i>Size of Bibliographic Database</i>	<i>Cost of Copy Cataloging Record</i>	<i>Cost of Original Cataloging Record</i>
Baker & Taylor	10 million	Print = .40 AV unedited = .75	AV edited = \$1.50
Brodart	15 million	\$1.25	\$4.00
Ingram	17 million	.40	\$10 to \$12
Midwest Tapes	?? million	Ranges from zero to \$1.20	\$10 to \$12
OverDrive	?? million	Ranges from zero to \$1.50	Not available

- **Costs** – The costs will vary depending on the amount of materials ordered annually – among a host of other factors. However, most vendors provide copy cataloging records ranging from free to \$1.25 for copy cataloging and \$4 to \$12 for original cataloging, assuming the library has purchased the item from the vendor.

## Outsourcing Vendors

Libraries have been outsourcing cataloging and processing of materials for decades but still the topic of outsourcing is sure to cause an extended discussion. Embedded within the outsourcing discussion is the ongoing debate over the cost versus benefits or value of cataloging.

Typically a library cataloging outsourcing vendor will contract to perform the work remotely. The library sends a list of materials that have been ordered and the vendor returns cataloging records (some libraries have ordered materials shipped to the outsourcing vendors). The vendors typically charge for copy cataloging and original cataloging separately. Use of an outsourcing vendor may reduce (or eliminate) the catalogers working in a library. Some outsourcing vendors use the library's OCLC account (or the vendor's own OCLC account) as a source of records while at least one outsourcing vendor (Library Services Center) maintains their own bibliographic database.

Among the many vendors in this field are Cassidy Cataloging, LAC Group, Library Cataloging Solutions, Library Services Centre, Zenith Information Management Services, and yes even OCLC will provide processing and cataloging services for a fee.

**LAC-Group** – The LAC-Group is a large company offering a variety of services to all types of libraries. Cataloging can be done remotely or on-site and the LAC catalogs using the customer library's OCLC account. Libraries submit a file of titles that have been ordered (ISBNs in a spreadsheet) that need cataloging records. For English language monographs, the cost of copy cataloging is about \$40 per hour (with 10 or more titles cataloged per hour). For original cataloging, the normal charge is about \$50 per hour.



**Library Services Centre (LSC)** – is a full-service cataloging and processing center located in Kitchener, Ontario Canada. LSC is a not-for-profit corporation whose members are library boards that provide acquisitions, cataloging, and processing services for public libraries. LSC serves more than 200 institutions and supplied more than 1 million items in the past year.

U.S. public libraries could send a list of titles ordered and the LSC could return MARC records or MARC records plus labels. The LSC has a MARC cataloging database that contains about 1.5 million records.

- **Breadth** – The LSC provides access to all of the most recently published materials.
- **Quality** – High quality MARC records are delivered to the library.
- **Ease of Use** – Rather than connecting to an online system, the library supplies the ISBNs or UPC code of the items ordered and LSC returns a MARC bibliographic record (and spine and barcode labels if ordered).
- **Costs** – \$1.00 per item for a MARC record (including associated item information) for copy cataloging and \$3.75 for original cataloging.

## COMPARISON OF CATALOGING ALTERNATIVES

Based on the experiences of the consortia that participated in this study, few problems are experienced when loading MARC records from multiple sources. Every ILS system provides a relatively robust method for comparing a record being imported against the existing database to identify possible duplicate records using a combination of data elements. Typically the ILS systems use a combination of OCLC record number, ISBN/ISSN, LCCN, and in some cases, a combination of the author and title. The hierarchy of what fields to check first, second, third and so forth is under the control of the ILS customer.

The following table summarizes all of the available options for obtaining cataloging records from a source(s) other than OCLC. Clearly no single option is going to provide the “magic bullet” for all of the RAILS libraries but it is good to be in a position where several alternatives provide good options. Given that libraries are reluctant to give up cataloging and processing of materials they acquire each year, providing access to SkyRiver as a source of cataloging records will result in considerable cataloging cost savings for the RAILS member libraries.

In addition, it is recognized that libraries will continue to rely on the vendors that supply materials for bibliographic records. And many libraries will continue to download MARC records from other libraries using the Z39.50 protocol. And for libraries that wish to outsource their cataloging, the availability of a regional cataloging center will be an attractive option.

Table 3. Comparison of Cataloging Alternatives

<b>Option</b>	<b>Source of Bib Records</b>	<b>Size of Bib Database</b>	<b>Quality of a Bib Record</b>	<b>Cost of a Bib Record</b>
SkyRiver	LC + contributions from libraries	70+ million records	High	Varies – from ??
Other libraries using Z39.50	Varies – LC, OCLC, materials vendors	Unknown – estimated to be over 75 million records	High generally	The bibliographic records are free and can be easily downloaded
Internet resources	LC plus member contributed brief records	Over 100 million bib records	Mixed – short records in many cases	Records are free but some software programming is required
Material vendors, e.g., B&T, Brodart, Ingram, Midwest Tapes	LC, publishers, and original cataloging	Varies – the largest is 17 million records	High generally	Varies - \$1.25 up to \$4.00, depending on modifications to the record
Outsourcing – Library Services Centre	LC, National Library of Canada, other libraries using Z39.50	1.5 million MARC records	Quite good – authority control	\$1.00 per title for copy cataloging and \$3.75 for original cataloging

## THE INTERLIBRARY LOAN ALTERNATIVES

Interlibrary loan or ILL has long been used to provide access to information resources beyond what is available in the local library collection. Based on the results of several studies and ignoring delivery costs, about 2/3rds of total ILL costs are borne by the lending library.

Public libraries, especially libraries that are in a consortium with a shared online catalog (or contribute local library records to a regional or statewide union catalog to facilitate resource sharing), have found that the 80/20 rule applies – 80% (or more) of all ILL transactions occur within the shared online catalog and usually are called within-system loans (rather than ILL transactions) – while a smaller percent of ILL transactions occur as a result of a regional or statewide union catalog.

For example, a total of 322,631 patron-initiated holds/ILL requests were placed in Montana's statewide union catalog last year. 88% of these holds/requests were filled within the state (the state turned to OCLC to fill the other 12%).

Increasingly libraries are moving from a model of request and delivery of physical information resources to one that delivers a variety of resources in multiple formats (with the need to change the associated workflows in the local library).

And while direct patron-mediated ILL requests provided by almost all academic libraries have led to a significant increase in the number of ILL requests (in some cases, more than 100% in the first year), a majority of public libraries have placed a variety of constraints on ILL borrowing to minimize the fiscal impact on the local library budget.

Some libraries have developed an ILL purchase program whereby items are purchased rather than initiating an ILL request for the item. Typically these ILL

purchase programs are begun in order to: save money, provide more rapid turn-around time for delivery, to fill gaps in a collection, and to fill requests that otherwise would go unfilled. The authors of a survey of libraries with ILL purchase programs developed a list of best practices:<sup>8</sup>

- Adding the ability for patrons to indicate “the library should purchase this item” to the ILL request form (online or paper form)
- Having a dedicated ILL purchase budget
- Purchase/rent more eBooks and eArticles.

Yet despite the fact that purchase programs improve quality of service for patrons and reduced costs for the local library, libraries have been slow to embrace ILL purchase programs.

David Lewis, the Dean of the IUPUI University Libraries in Indianapolis, has suggested developing a “User-Driven Purchase Giveaway Library” using print-on-demand technology. The library would pay for the license to print a book (the book would not be cataloged) and the finished product would be delivered to the patron with no expectation that the book would be returned to the library. In David’s view, such an approach would save libraries money while improving the quality of service to the patron.

Users of an online (union) catalog are interested in finding out:

- What libraries own the item
- If the item is immediately available for use (on the shelf)
- More information about the item optionally available (cover image, summary, table of contents)

---

<sup>8</sup> De Jong, C.J. and Heidi Nance. In a World of Amazon, is it Time to Rethink ILL? *Interlending & Document Supply*, 42 (2/3), 2014, 42-50.

- Links to online content/full text.<sup>9</sup>

RAILS is currently exploring the costs and benefits of creating a RAILS regional catalog as part of its resource sharing overlay project. It is possible to imagine three approaches to such a RAILS regional catalog:

1. RAILS might develop software that would automatically route an ILL request to each library consortium with a shared online catalog (or libraries with a standalone ILS). The software would determine if a title was to be found in the online catalog and if an ILL request could be placed on the item. If the title was not found or could not be borrowed, then the software would repeat the process at a different shared online catalog. The software would be optimized to balance the requests evenly to all libraries. Note that this option would *not need a union catalog* of library holdings but *would require* the development of custom software. Given the risks and costs of customer software development, this option is not recommended.
2. RAILS could encourage the existing consortia with shared automated systems to merge with one another. A large, shared ILS that would service the entire RAILS service area could be created, using proprietary or open source software (similar to the shared system in the Illinois Heartland Library System). This would, in effect, create a shared online catalog for the northern half of the state of Illinois. This RAILS shared catalog would expose a very large collection to all patrons and significantly reduce ILL discovery costs (although direct borrowing would likely increase due to increased visibility and borrowing of resources).

---

<sup>9</sup> Calhoun, Karen, Joanne Cantrell, Peggy Gallagher and Janet Hawk. *Online Catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want*. Dublin, OH: OCLC, 2009.

Resource sharing within RAILS is not a “one size fits all” approach. RAILS represents libraries of all types (academic, public, school, and special) and sizes, and these libraries have chosen different integrated library system (ILS) software to meet their needs. Many libraries belong to one of 11 different ILS consortia within RAILS. Many others use standalone systems.

RAILS encourages resource sharing through membership in ILS consortia and would support member-driven movement toward fewer but larger consortia. However, RAILS recognizes that most RAILS members have made a huge investment in their current ILS and are unlikely to abandon it to join a single RAILS shared catalog. At this point in time, the overlay project seems to be the most practical solution to further resource-sharing efforts in the RAILS area and beyond.

3. RAILS could select a vendor to provide a RAILS discovery and ILL service. The vendor would load the catalogs of consortia and libraries with standalone ILS systems that are interested in participating, into a single RAILS regional catalog and support the software for an annual licensing fee.

Several states have created statewide ILS systems (that also enable patrons to place a hold on any item in the database) or have created statewide ILL systems using open source or proprietary software – and in some cases are using a vendor-provided ILL service.

One of the biggest challenges that must be overcome is using MARC records from multiple sources means, which several record control numbers must be used to ensure a high quality database is created. Typically a vendor provides options so that record control numbers are examined in a hierarchical sequence to determine whether an incoming

record is a possible duplicate for a record that already exists in the database. The record control numbers that are usually used include: ISBN, LCC, OCLC number, other vendor ID number, and a combination of author and title.

One important component of a RAILS ILL service would be to ensure that the system selected supports the Z39.83 NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol or NCIP standard. The NCIP protocol facilitates the exchange of messages between automated systems to borrow and lend items, to provide controlled access to electronic resources, and to manage the exchange of these messages. Within the ILL arena, NCIP allows one system to determine whether a resource is available for borrowing and then to complete the borrowing request transaction.

Each approach provides some strengths and weaknesses but at the end of the day, all libraries would have access to a RAILS regional catalog to facilitate resource sharing.



## COMPARISON OF INTERLIBRARY LOAN ALTERNATIVES

Ignoring the states that have a statewide ILS (of which many ILL transactions are actually holds placed by the patron), the following table provides information about the maintenance costs for various ILL systems, ignoring personnel costs, operating at the state level. Clearly the greater the number of ILL requests the lower the cost per transaction.

Table 4. Comparison of Statewide ILL System Costs

<i>State</i>	<i>Annual Cost of Operation</i>	<i>Number of Fulfilled ILL Requests Last Year</i>	<i>Cost per Fulfilled ILL Request</i>
Colorado – INN-Reach	\$ 175,000	600,000	\$ .29
Connecticut - SHAREit	513,916	128,384	4.00
Kansas - SHAREit	448,452	123,447	3.63
Louisiana - SHAREit	135,000	85,000	1.59
	125,000*	11,000*	11.36*
Maryland – Relais	69,785	285,107	.25
Michigan – INN-Reach	450,000	1,096,689	.41
Mississippi - SHAREit	54,000	14,521	3.72
Montana – SirsiDynix	219,919	231,343	.95
New Jersey - SHAREit	483,000	130,310	3.71
Wisconsin - SHAREit	386,250	179,966	2.15
Br Columbia – SHAREit	118,000	107,163	1.10
INN-Reach Averages	\$ 312,500	848,345	\$ .37
Relais Averages #	\$ 69,785	285,107	\$ .25
SHAREit Averages	\$ 305,517	109,827	\$ 2.78

\* Data for OCLC

# Only 1 library

The LINKin libraries in Illinois use a combination of INN-Reach and OCLC for sharing resources. Associated ILL staff costs total \$46,135 and half the costs are allocated to each system in the following table. The costs for this resource sharing service are shown here.

Table 5. Costs of LINKin INN-Reach ILL Transactions

<i>State</i>	<i>Annual Cost of Operation</i>	<i>Number of Fulfilled ILL Requests Last Year</i>	<i>Cost per Fulfilled ILL Request</i>
INN-Reach	\$ 25,000		
INN-Reach + staff	48,068	24,563	\$ 1.96
OCLC	18,000		
OCLC + staff	41,067	5,259	7.81
Combined	\$ 89,135	29,822	\$ 2.99

Providing access to regional (or statewide) library holdings information that is visible to library patrons results in a large number of materials being moved from one library to another. Providing access to this information through a RAILS system, rather than using the OCLC WorldCat and WorldShare (ILL) system, will result in significant annual savings for RAILS libraries.

Were RAILS to use a large, regional ILS system (such as the Heartland system is doing), then the costs of providing the RAILS catalog and ILL requesting service would be less than using an ILL-only system (the cost of ILL is one module in a larger system whose costs are distributed among a larger group of libraries).

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of this project was to explore the various alternatives that may exist for cataloging and interlibrary loan services (other than the continued use of OCLC as a sole provider).

Note that the library consortia that obtain cataloging bibliographic records from a variety of sources do not experience significant problems with the loading of records and identifying possible duplicate records. In some cases, bibliographic records are obtained from a single source such as SkyRiver or the Library of Congress, while in other cases records are obtained from multiple libraries using the Z39.50 protocol, or the records might be obtained from a single outsourced service.

In addition, the consortia reported that they prefer not to load cataloging records from material vendors since they are often loading (and then discarding) the same bibliographic record for popular materials (multiple libraries are ordering one or more copies of a best seller for example). Public libraries create and maintain collections that are duplicated from 60 to as much as 80 percent of the time (this is called collection overlap). It is also possible to load the holdings information from the records provided by the materials vendor without loading the bibliographic record.

There are several important implications about moving away from the exclusive use of OCLC for cataloging and interlibrary loan services and they include:

- The RAILS member libraries would spend about half of what they currently expend using OCLC for cataloging and interlibrary loan (and the savings could be even more over time) by using one or more cataloging alternatives identified in this report.

- The accuracy of the holdings of RAILS member libraries reflected in the OCLC WorldCat database will, over time, be significantly reduced. As libraries move away from OCLC services there is less incentive to keep the bibliographic data current due to the costs imposed by OCLC to do so.
- The RAILS member libraries will have more fiscal and administrative control over the way in which services are provided by embracing technologies and processes that they directly control rather than continuing to pay for OCLC services.

With this in mind, the following recommendations are made.

### **Investigate a SkyRiver Master Agreement**

RAILS should investigate a master agreement with SkyRiver for a minimum of five years, on behalf of its member libraries, that is similar to the agreement made by the Colorado Library Consortium. RAILS would assume responsibility for marketing, training, as well as providing support for the SkyRiver product in exchange for significantly reduced annual licensing fees. RAILS could provide 6-8 levels of licensing fees, based on size of library (or consortium) to ensure that the SkyRiver product was affordable for all libraries.

And while moving to SkyRiver will take some time, the cost saving for Illinois libraries are likely to be significant. However, such a decision will have an impact on the statewide, shared union catalog using OCLC's WorldCat as well as interlibrary loan.

### **Create a Cataloging Center**

RAILS should establish a centralized cataloging center that would provide cataloging, particularly when original cataloging is needed, for member libraries as an outsourcing option. Such an operation, organized around type of materials

to be processed could be optimized using Lean and Six Sigma principles to operate in an efficient and timely manner. Some or all of these services might be provided through an agreement with the Illinois Heartland Library System, thus expanding cooperation among Illinois library systems. The services of this cataloging center would provide an attractive alternative for outsourcing among libraries within the RAILS region.

A RAILS cataloging center would provide a consistent level of cataloging for member libraries using SkyRiver as a primary source of cataloging records. The first phase of operation should concentrate on providing service to consortia and the center could grow over time as demand for its services grows.

### **Create a RAILS Regional Catalog/ILL System**

A state-of-the-art RAILS regional catalog/ILL system should be created for interested member libraries as envisioned by the overlay project that will provide both discovery and fulfillment. This regional catalog could become an option on each library's online catalog so that a patron could choose to view the holdings of other RAILS member libraries. The regional catalog would also allow patrons to place a hold on an item and have the item delivered to their local library. Records from all libraries/consortia with ILSs interested in participating would be loaded into the regional catalog/ILL system.

Given that more than 80% or more of all borrowing of materials occurs among libraries within a consortium sharing an integrated library system (or within a statewide union catalog), this recommendation has the potential to dramatically improve the quality of resource sharing among RAILS member libraries while at the same time noticeably reducing costs for interlibrary loan among member libraries.

### **Make the RAILS Regional Catalog Discoverable**

Open up the RAILS regional catalog database to the Google (and other) Web crawlers so the full contents of the catalog are visible when people use Google to find things of interest. For far too long, library databases (including the catalog) have been hidden behind walls and exist in silos. It is time to make the high quality library databases work harder so that people “find” the library more often when they want and need access to quality information.

### **Encourage Libraries to Evaluate Purchasing Materials in Lieu of Using ILL**

RAILS should encourage each library to determine when purchasing an item is better (less expensive and may result in the patron receiving an item faster) than initiating an ILL request. This will improve the patron’s experience by receiving requested materials in a timely manner and save money for both the requesting and lending libraries in the normal ILL transaction.

### **Periodically Offer a Webinar on Cataloging Alternatives**

Periodically offering a Webinar about the strengths and limitations of each of the cataloging and technical service alternatives will benefit the RAILS member libraries.

## Appendix

### Bergen County Cooperative Library System (BCCLS), Hackensack, New Jersey

**About:** BCCLS is a non-profit with all operating expenses paid for by the fees the libraries impose on themselves. There are 77 public library members in the counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, and Passaic New Jersey. The BCCLS database contains about 1 million titles.

**Approach to Cataloging:** BCCLS has a centralized cataloging department (2 ½ staff members) that are responsible for adding records and maintaining the bibliographic database. Records are obtained from LC and from other libraries using the Z39.50 protocol. Holdings are not reported to OCLC.

Member libraries add items and patron information. This significantly improves the quality of the database. With all costs included, cost of cataloging is about \$3 per title added. BCCLS adds about 50-55,000 titles per year.

**Shared Catalog:** Patrons placed more than 1 million requests last year for materials located in one of the 77 member libraries. More than 99 percent of the requests are filled.

**ILL:** ILL requests are placed in a statewide ILL system run by the State Library. The State Library spends about \$1 million each year on delivery services.

### Black Gold Cooperative Library Network, San Luis Obispo, California

**About:** Black Gold serves the six public libraries (30 locations) in San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. The shared database contains some 400,000 bibliographic records plus 1.1 million item records. About 9,000 titles are added each year.

**Approach to Cataloging:** Black Gold formerly used OCLC but in 2011 moved to use of SkyRiver for source of cataloging records and cataloging costs were cut in half. Member libraries typically find fiction records using SkyRiver (or create short records) while the Black Gold Cooperative enters records using SkyRiver for all non-fiction materials. SkyRiver provides 99%+ of the needed bibliographic records. Holdings are not reported to OCLC.

The LCCN and then ISBN/ISSN is used when loading records. The Polaris ILS system provides a report of possible duplicate records.

**Shared Catalog:** More than 99 percent of the requests patrons placed last year were filled using the shared catalog.

**ILL:** ILL requests are kept to a minimum since the libraries have imposed a \$15 per ILL request due to fiscal restrictions.

## Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL), Denver, Colorado

**About:** CARL members include 13 academic libraries and 1 public library and the libraries have a shared online catalog. The CARL database has over 12 million unique titles and more than 32 million items.

### Approach to Cataloging:

Decentralized – Each academic library obtains records from OCLC (and thus their holdings are known by OCLC). The public library uses SkyRiver and holdings are not reported to OCLC.

Each library decides whether all or some records are visible in the shared online catalog. Records imported into the shared catalog uses the OCLC record ID number first and then match using ISBN and then LCCN to identify possible duplicate records.

**Shared Catalog:** Requests are placed directly by patrons in an INN-Reach shared catalog system – operated by CARL for 44 libraries – about half are public and half are academic. More than 600,000 items were borrowed in the last year.

**ILL:** For requests not found in the state system, academic libraries turn to OCLC while public libraries rely on the state system or the library will purchase items.

## Colorado Library Consortium (CLiC), Centennial, Colorado

**About:** CLiC is a statewide library cooperative and works towards the following goals:

- “Expedite the discovery, selection, and delivery of information and materials to library patrons in Colorado.”
- “Provide and support learning opportunities for ongoing professional development resulting in improved services in libraries.”
- “Identify and support initiatives to strengthen the Colorado library community.”

CLiC operates a statewide delivery service and AspenCat, an ILS system for 75 public, academic, school and special libraries.

### Approach to Cataloging:

AspenCat libraries use SkyRiver as a source of cataloging records. Cataloging is decentralized so each library adds records each day.

**Shared Catalog:** Another union catalog run by the Marmot Library Network has libraries contributing records from both OCLC and SkyRiver.

**ILL:** Colorado libraries use an INN-Reach system operated by CARL for ILL transactions.



## Lakeland Library Cooperative, Grand Rapids, Michigan

**About:** Lakeland Library Cooperative is a public library consortium with 40 member libraries. It currently serves just over 700,000 patrons, and it has over 800,000 bibliographic records with about 4.4 million items. Its system annual circulation is about 9.6 million. Its patrons place about 1.2 million holds per year.

**Approach to Cataloging:** The cooperative started doing centralized cataloging of bibliographic records in the 1990's. The Cooperative uses SkyRiver. Holding records are not reported to OCLC.

**Shared Catalog:** Its "intrasystem" sharing count is over 400,000 (loans between members of the shared system).

**ILL:** The MelCat system, a statewide ILL system, itself handles over 95,000 requests on an annual basis. The Lakeland Library Cooperative accounts for 20,000 incoming items and 25,000 outgoing items within the MelCat system.

## The Library Network (TLN), Novi, Michigan

**About:** TLN has 73 member libraries, all of them public libraries. The shared ILS that is maintained at TLN is used in 53 library buildings.

**Approach to Cataloging:** All cataloging is performed centrally using SkyRiver. Libraries are permitted to enter brief records into the database, which are overlaid with full records by TLN cataloging staff. Holding records are not reported to OCLC. The use of SkyRiver has substantially reduced cataloging costs.

The cataloger handles the (relatively low volume) original cataloging, which generally consists of local publications, foreign language titles, self-published materials, etc.

Member libraries add item records.

**Shared Catalog:** Patrons place "holds" on materials, regardless of location, using the shared online catalog.

**ILL:** The libraries use the MelCat system, a statewide ILL system (INN-reach).

## **MOBIUS, Columbia, Missouri**

**About:** MOBIUS has 72 member libraries and most are using OCLC for cataloging. Currently there are 4 libraries that are using SkyRiver (and several libraries expect to switch to SkyRiver in 2015).

### **Approach to Cataloging:**

Cataloging is decentralized. Libraries move records to be loaded onto a secure server maintained by MOBIUS, which then loads the records (control the loading of records to prevent overloading the systems). All bibliographic records are periodically updated using authority control records from Backstage.

**Shared Catalog:** MOBIUS operates 11 clusters of the III ILS system (each cluster is geographically located). All the servers are hosted by Innovative in California but MOBIUS staff controls the operation of each ILS.

**ILL:** MOBIUS uses the III INN-Reach system. INN-Reach communicates with each III ILS system to both create a central union catalog but also to place requests for an item not located in a cluster ILS system. INN-Reach contains about 1.7 million bib records.

In 2014, about 300,000 items were requested using the MOBIUS INN-Reach system (and thus, these transactions did not go to OCLC).

## **OWLSnet Public Library System, Appleton, Wisconsin**

**About:** OWLSnet has 49 public libraries, 2 members are public/school library combinations sharing a building.

### **Approach to Cataloging:**

Majority of cataloging is done centrally using SkyRiver, 3 full-time catalogers and 1 part-time assistant. The consortium adds about 120,000 titles per year. Holding records are not reported to OCLC. The consortium saves more than 60% of OCLC costs by moving to SkyRiver.

**Shared Catalog:** Majority of borrowing occurs among libraries within the OWLSnet system.

**ILL:** Records shared with WISCat, the statewide ILL system, using NCIP.

## **SAILS Library Network, Lakeville, Massachusetts**

**About:** SAILS is a multi-type network serving libraries in 39 communities in Southeastern Massachusetts. The service population in the communities is slightly over 700,000. The membership consists of 38 public libraries, 2 academic libraries, 1 historical society and 20 K-12 media centers located in 76 buildings.

**Approach to Cataloging:** One academic member with an OCLC subscription may load records. Other members create short cataloging request records, which are overlaid with full cataloging by network staff using SkyRiver. Holding records are not reported to OCLC. More than 50,000 title records are added each year.

**Shared Catalog:** The patrons of the SAILS member libraries place holds on materials regardless of their location. More than 99 percent of all ILL-holds are found in the SAILS online catalog.

**ILL:** The Massachusetts State Library operates a statewide ILL system. Libraries place ILL requests on behalf of their patrons.

## **Libraries of Middlesex Automation Consortium (LMxAC), Avenel, New Jersey**

**About:** The Libraries of Middlesex Automation Consortium is a not-for-profit membership organization, which provides a full range of library automation services to its member libraries. Membership currently consists of 28 member libraries: 27 public libraries and one community college. The consortium also provides access to licensed shared eResources and PC support.

**Approach to Cataloging:** The LMxAC consortium provides centralized cataloging – records come from a variety of sources. Majority of records come from materials vendors – B&T, Ingram, Overdrive, Midwest Tapes, etc. LMxAC also uses OCLC's CatExpress – cost is \$10,000 and you can download a maximum of 10,000 bibliographic records. Also use Z39.50 for some records. Holding records are not reported to OCLC. 82,058 titles and 154,170 items were added in 2014.

**Shared Catalog:** Majority of ILL requests are direct borrowing from within the consortium (240,000 last year). Other 10%, 2,400 requests, used the state union catalog.

**ILL:** The New Jersey State Library operates a statewide ILL system. Libraries place ILL requests on behalf of their patrons.

## **MINERVA – The State of Maine**

**About:** 58 libraries: Medium and small public libraries, small private academics, Maine Community Colleges, Maine Historical Society, 2 hospital libraries. Catalog contains about 1.25 million bibliographic records.

### **Approach to Cataloging:**

Cataloging is decentralized. Use Z39.50 software to obtain bibliographic records – have a long list of libraries they can visit. The advantage is that it's affordable to the membership, who could not manage the costs of OCLC membership and are not interested as a consortium in paying for local contract cataloging or the staff necessary to handle cataloging centrally. All 50+ branches have to get records in somehow. The disadvantages are the lack of bibliographic control for quality or duplication. A 10hr/week contract cataloger who handles the authorities loads to Marcive and does what she can to improve the database quality.

**Shared Catalog:** Minerva is a shared library system that brings together nearly 60 libraries of all types from across the state. Minerva is self-governed by a Users Council and an Executive Board with technical management and support provided by Maine InfoNet.

**ILL:** The statewide ILL system, MaineCat (an INN-Reach union catalog) is run by the State Library.

## **The Washington Idaho Network (WIN), Spokane, Washington**

WIN member libraries include: Spokane Community College, Spokane Falls Community College, Gonzaga University, North Idaho College, Lewis-Clark State College, OPALL, and Whitworth University libraries.

### **Approach to Cataloging:**

Cataloging is decentralized and records come a variety of sources – OCLC, material vendors (B&T, Ingram, Overdrive, and many others), and Z39.50. Libraries do a lot of bulk loading of records, libraries use an authority control vendor so must deal with the re-load of improved records. Non-OCLC records are not reported to OCLC.

**Shared Catalog:** The shared online database contains about 1.940 million titles. The libraries move more than 100,000 items each year in response to patron requests.

**ILL:** If an item can't be located in the WIN catalog, libraries submit an ILL request using OCLC.

## **Library Services Centre (LSC), Toronto, Ontario Canada**

**About:** Library Services Centre (LSC) is a library owned, not-for-profit, corporation that supplies material to more than 150 public libraries across Canada. LSC supplies processing and cataloguing in conjunction with the supply of the material itself. More than 80% of the 1,186,000 items that LSC supplied last year were catalogued and processed. When an item is shipped to the library, a MARC record file matching the invoice is created for the library to upload to their local system.

LSC has 102 members.

- ❖ It supplies services to another 90+ non-members
- ❖ Non-member customers are:
  - 90% public libraries;
  - 8% schools;
  - 2% miscellaneous

### **Approach to Cataloging:**

LSC's internal cataloguing department does all cataloguing. In most instances, LSC produces a single core record. LSC's customized MARC extract program then creates the MARC record that is sent to the library based on the library's requirements. This process is automated. LSC supplied more than 140,000 titles last year; of these 70,000 were new.

LSC's MARC record database has more than 1,500,000 MARC records. It has been under authority control since 1994 and all records are linked to authorities. Authority MARC records are provided with all MARC files, based on the library's profile. MARC records are in English, French and more than 20 foreign languages. Effective April 1, 2015, all new LSC MARC records will have RDA content.

Bibliographic records are obtained from the Library of Congress, National Library of Canada, selected library databases using Z39.50 agents. The Z39.50 software was created and is supported by the Service Center.

**Shared Catalog:** Not applicable.

**ILL:** Not applicable.

## Bibliography

Bailey-Hainer, Brenda, Anne Beaubien, Beth Posner and Evan Simpson. *Rethinking Library Resource Sharing: New Models for Collaboration*. Paper presented at the IFLA WLIC 2013 Conference in Singapore. Available at <http://library.ifla.org/379/>

Banerjee, Kyle. Taking Advantage of Outsourcing Options: Using Purchased Record Sets to Maximize Cataloging Effectiveness. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 32 (1), 2001, 55-64.

Beheshti, J. *The use of NLC MARC Records in Canadian libraries, Phase I: University And Large Urban Public Libraries, Final Report, 31 March 2002*. Montreal, McGill University, Graduate School of Library and Information Studies. Executive Summary available at: <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/cataloguing-standards/040006-2211-e.html>

Beheshti, J. *The Use of NLC MARC Records in Canadian Libraries. Phase II. Federal Government and Non-public CALUPS Public Libraries*. Report prepared for the National Library of Canada, 2003.

Bosch, Stephen, Cory Tucker, Christopher L. Sugnet, and Lauren E. Corbett. *Do Libraries Still Need Book Subscription Vendors and Subscription Agents?* Chicago: ALCTS, October 2011. Available at <http://www.ala.org/alcts/resources/z687/vend>

Calhoun, Karen. *Changing Nature Of The Catalog And Its Integration With Other Discovery Tools*: Report prepared for the Library of Congress, 2006. Available at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/calhoun-report-final.pdf>

Calhoun, Karen, Joanne Cantrell, Peggy Gallagher and Janet Hawk. *Online Catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want*. Dublin, OH: OCLC, 2009.

Campbell, Grant, and Karl Fast. Panizi, Lubetzky, and Google: How the Modern Web Environment is Reinventing the Theory of Cataloging. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 26 (3), 2004, 25-38.

CARLI. *Best Practices for Bibliographic Records from Non-OCLC Sources*. Last updated December 2010. Available at <http://www.carli.illinois.edu/products-services/i-share/cat/vendorrecs>

Coyle, Karen. The Library Catalog in a 2.0 World. *Journal of Academic*

*Librarianship*, 32 (2), March 2007, 189-191.

Danskin, Alan. *Tomorrow Never Knows: The End Of Cataloging?* Paper presented at IFLA, Seoul, Korea, 2006. Available at:

<http://www.ifla.org/IVifla72/papers/102-Danskin-en.pdf>

De Jong, C.J. and Heidi Nance. In a World of Amazon, is it Time to Rethink ILL? *Interlending & Document Supply*, 42 (2/3), 2014, 42-50.

El-Sherbini, Magna. Sharing Cataloging Expertise: Options for Libraries to Share Their Skilled Catalogers with Other Libraries. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 48, 2010, 525-540.

Ferguson, Chris. Technology Left Behind: Social Cataloging and the Library OPAC. *Against the Grain*, 21 (1), Article 51, 2009. Available at:

<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg/vol21/iss1/51>

Fischer, Ruth, Rick Lugg. *Study of the North American MARC Records Marketplace*. Report prepared for the Library of Congress. October 2009.

Available at [http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/MARC\\_Record\\_Marketplace\\_2009-10.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/MARC_Record_Marketplace_2009-10.pdf)

Fischer, Ruth, Rick Lugg and Kent Boese. Cataloging: How to Take a Business Approach. *The Bottom Line*, 2004.

Fox, Robert. Cataloging for the Masses. *OCLC Systems & Services*, 22 (3), 2006, 166-172.

Gardner, Sue Ann. Cresting toward the Sea Change: Literature Review of Cataloging and Classification 2009-10. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 56 (2), April 2012, 64-79.

Godby, Carol Jean and Ray Denenberg. *Common Ground: Exploring Compatibilities Between the Linked Data Models of the Library of Congress and OCLC*. Dublin, Ohio: Library of Congress and OCLC Research, 2015. Available at <http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2015/oclcresearch-loc-linkeddata-2015.pdf>

Giustini, Deana, Daniel Hooker, and Allan Cho. Social Cataloging: An Overview for Health Librarians. *JCHLA*, 30, 2009, 133-138.

Hvass, Anna. Cataloging with LibraryThing: As Easy as 1, 2, 3! *Library Hi Tech News*, 25 (10), 2008, 5-7.

Illinois Library Association. *The Future of Illinois Library Cooperation*. Chicago,



March 2012. Available at  
[http://www.ila.org/filcfiles/FOILC\\_Report\\_2012\\_R11.pdf](http://www.ila.org/filcfiles/FOILC_Report_2012_R11.pdf)

Indiana University, Task Force on the Future of Cataloging. (2006). *White paper on the future of cataloging at Indiana University*. Available at:  
[http://www.iub.edu/~libtserv/pub/Future\\_of\\_Cataloging\\_White\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.iub.edu/~libtserv/pub/Future_of_Cataloging_White_Paper.pdf)

Jackson, M.E. *Assessing ILL/DD Services: New Cost-Effective Alternatives*. Westport, CN: Greenwood, 2004.

Janes, Judy. SkyRiver or OCLC? A Cataloger's Choice. *Spectrum Online*, 16 (3), November 2011, 28.

Jay, Michael, Betsy Simpson, and Doug Smith. CatQC and Shelf-Ready Material: Speeding Collections to Users While Preserving Data Quality. *Information Technology and Libraries*, March 2009, 41-48.

Jefferies, Scott. Social Cataloging Tools: A Comparison and Application for Librarians. *Library Hi Tech News*, 25 (10), December 2008, 1-4.

Kemp, Rebecca. (2008). MARC Record Services: A Comparative Study Of Library Practices And Perceptions. *The Serials Librarian*, 55 (3).

Lewis, David. The User-Driven Purchase Giveaway Library. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 45 (5), 2020, 10-11.

Library of Congress. (2008) *On the Record: Report of the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control*. Available at:  
<http://loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/lcwg-ontherecord-jan08-final.pdf>

Luther, Judy. (2009). *Streamlining Book Metadata Workflow: A White Paper prepared for the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) and OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.* Available at:  
[http://www.niso.org/publications/white\\_papers/StreamlineBookMetadataWorkflowWhitePaper.pdf](http://www.niso.org/publications/white_papers/StreamlineBookMetadataWorkflowWhitePaper.pdf)

Mann, Thomas. Will Google's Keyword Searching Eliminate the Need for LC Cataloging and Classification? *Journal of Library Metadata*, 8 (2), 2008, 159-168.

Marcum, Deanna. (2008). *Deanna Marcum's response to On the Record: Report of the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control*. Available at: <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/LCWGResponse-Marcum-Final-061008.pdf>



Park, Sung-ran and Caimei Lu. Application of Semi-Automatic Metadata Generation in Libraries: Types, Tools, and Techniques. *Library & Information Science Research*, 31, 2009, 225-231.

Research Information Network. (2009). *Creating Catalogues: Bibliographic Records In A Networked World*. Available at:  
[http://www.rin.ac.uk/files/creating\\_catalogues\\_REPORT\\_June09.pdf](http://www.rin.ac.uk/files/creating_catalogues_REPORT_June09.pdf)

Schonfeld, Roger C. and Brian Lavoie. Books without boundaries: a brief tour of the system-wide book collection. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 9 (2), 2006.

Schroeder, Rebecca and Jared Howland. Shelf-ready: A Cost-Benefit Analysis. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*. 35 (4), 2011, 129-134.

Schuitema, Joan. The Future of Cataloging: Curve, Fork, or Impasse? *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 48, 2010, 258-270.

Spiteri, Louise. The Impact of Social Cataloging Sites on the Construction of Bibliographic Records in the Public Library Catalog. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 47:1, 2009, 52-73.

Stumpf, Frances. Centralized Cataloging and Processing for Public Library Consortia. *The Bottom Line*, 3, 2003, 93-99.

Terrill, Lori. Catalogers' Perceptions and Use of Social Media and Conventional Information Sources for Professional Development. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 52:2, 2014, 181-228.

Thomas, Sarah. Quality In Bibliographic Control – History And Future Of Cataloging In Libraries: Perspective On Quality In Libraries. *Library Trends*, Winter 1996, 491-505.

University of California Libraries Bibliographic Services Task Force. *Final Report: Rethinking How We Provide Bibliographic Services, 2005*. Available at:  
<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sppaq/BSTF/Final.pdf>

Van Dyk, Gerrit. Interlibrary Loan Purchase-on-Demand: A Misleading Literature. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 35, 2011, 83-89.

Wolven, Robert. In Search Of A New Model: Columbia University Libraries: Robert Wolven Reflects On What's Next For Cooperative Cataloging. *netConnect*, January 15, 2008.

Wu, Annie, and Annie Mitchell. Mass Management of E-Book Catalog Records: Approaches, Challenges, and Solutions. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 54(3), 2010, 164-174

Zopfi-Jordan, David. Purchasing or Borrowing: Making Interlibrary Loan Decisions That enhance Patron Satisfaction. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 18 (3), 2008, 387-394.